REMARKS

In the Office Action, claim 5 was objected to because of informalities.

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1 and 4-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hocking (GB Pat. No. 1,219,272) in view of Johnston (U.S. Pat. No. 6,729,624). Claims 2 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hocking in view of Johnston as applied to claims 1 and 4-9 above, and further in view of Sponagel et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,143,385).

Applicant would like to thank Examiner Lee and Examiner Patel for the consideration given applicant's attorney at the interview of January 9, 2008. At the interview, agreement was reached to amend claim 1 to overcome the Hocking reference. Accordingly, the application should be in condition for allowance subject to further search and reconsideration.

In response to the informalities noted by the Examiner, claim 6 has been amended. The objection to claim 5 has been rendered moot in view of the explanation offered at the interview. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance.

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claims in the present application, as they now stand, patentably distinguish over the references cited and applied by the Examiner and are, therefore, in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is in order, and such favorable action and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

However, if after reviewing the above amendments and remarks, the Examiner has any questions or comments, he is cordially invited to contact the undersigned attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

JACOBSON HOLMAN PLLC

By: John C. Holman Reg. No. 22,769

400 Seventh Street, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004-2201

(202) 638-6666

Date: January 15, 2008

JCH/JLS/crj